



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM AND ITS REMEDIES¹

EDWIN H. HALL,
Harvard University

This subject will be presented to us by Professor Edwin H. Hall, of Harvard University.

Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Association: I am informed that some of the gentlemen who were asked to take part in this debate, or discussion, on the opposite side from that which I take, have excused themselves on the ground that they have already said in public all that they have to say on this question. I might make the same excuse, perhaps, for I have already written and printed my opinion in regard to the subject which is before us this afternoon. I do not make excuse, however, for I take a lively and a hopeful interest in the discussion of this matter from the standpoint of the proposition that is on our program today.

I am quite aware that this body has no formal power in the matter, and I am very glad that it has not. The control of athletic matters is in most colleges in the hands of athletic committees; and I think, on the whole, it is wisely there. But athletic committees are influenced more or less by popular opinion. They may be impelled to take a certain action by popular opinion; they may be prevented, by popular opinion, from taking action they would like to take; and we are an important part of the public concerned with this matter.

The evils and the difficulties of the athletic situation are undoubtedly very great, but they are, in my opinion, exaggerated by an unfortunate habit which we have of looking to the money test as a means of distinguishing between the good and the bad, the base and the pure, in athletics. This habit is of so long standing, and we are so familiar with the scandals which are continually exposed in connection with this money rule, that most of us never ask whether the rule is a wise rule; and yet it seems to

¹At the twentieth annual meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools the following proposition was the first order of business: That the definition of athletic professionalism, as now written, is a source of demoralization in schools and colleges, and that the evils which this definition is intended to combat can be better met by limiting the number of games between institutions, and fixing standards of academic standing and academic age for the participants in such games.

me that we should naturally raise that question. When we find that a law, after being in force for many years, has, according to the declarations of its upholders, failed to produce the result which it was intended to produce, and produces, on the other hand, a yearly crop of exposures and scandals, I think it is proper for us to inquire whether that law is a wise law.

I am aware that in taking this position, in going counter to what is, I suppose, the very general popular opinion in regard to the matter, I run the risk of being regarded as wrong-headed, and as being mischievous, so far as what I say has any influence whatever. In fact, on both occasions on which I have appeared in print upon this matter, I have been more or less taken to task for my utterances by people whose objects, I suppose, were precisely the same as my own in regard to athletics. The last time, I was approached by a gentleman prominent in the athletic management of Harvard, who seemed to think that I had been guilty of two offenses: first, condoning the practices of the evil, and, second, bringing a railing accusation against the good; for I had maintained that, under the strict literal interpretation of the law defining professionalism, as that law now stands, only a very small proportion of students could maintain amateur standing. When I was charged with confusing the good and the evil, my reply was that it was not I, it was the law, that had done this thing; it was the rule.

Let me read the rule to which I refer before we go farther. This is the rule as it stands in the Harvard pamphlet—and I think it stands in substantially the same form in the athletic regulations of many other colleges:

No student shall be allowed to represent Harvard University in any public athletic contest, either individually or as a member of any team, who either before or since entering the university shall have engaged for money in any athletic competition, whether for a stake, or a money prize, or a share of the entrance fees or admission money, or who shall have taught or engaged in any athletic exercise or sport as a means of livelihood, or who shall at any time have received for taking part in any athletic sport or contest any pecuniary gain or emolument whatever, direct or indirect, with the single exception that he may have received from the college organization, or from any permanent amateur association of which he was at the time a member, the amount by which the expenses necessarily incurred by him in representing his organization in athletic contests exceeded his ordinary expenses.

My last publication on this matter was in the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*. Going through the college yard one day, about the time I wrote that article, I saw two boys, perhaps ten years old, who were running about the yard, watched by a group near one of the halls. Apparently—

I don't know that it was true, but apparently—these two youngsters were running about the yard for some small prize offered by the spectators. Now, according to that rule as it stands, those boys are by that act forever debarred from taking part in any public athletic contest in Harvard University, from representing it in any intercollegiate contest. You will say that is absurd; it is nonsense to talk about so small a matter as being intended by this rule. You will say you could make any rule seem absurd by taking an extreme case. Very well; if you think that is an extreme case—and it is—please tell me what you think is the dividing line between infractions of this rule which count and infractions which do not count. You will all say that a prize of ten cents for a boy ten years old ought not to count. Suppose it is one dollar for twelve years; does that count? Suppose it is two dollars for fourteen years; does that count? Suppose it is five dollars for sixteen years; does that count? Somewhere comes a dividing line, and no one of you can tell where it comes, and the boy himself cannot tell where it comes.

Now, what is the inevitable result of that condition? The inevitable result of it is that the boy will give himself the benefit of the doubt; he will say: "This rule is not to be taken literally; I have got to interpret it according to my judgment; and when I go to college I am not going to tell the athletic committee every little affair of this sort. They would laugh at me, if I did." Isn't that inevitably the state of mind in which the boy must be?

Occasionally a boy is brought up, is disciplined; he has his amateur head cut off for some offense which comes under this law, which I think he could not fairly have understood, could not inevitably have understood, to be intended by the law. Tell me whether under this law a young man has a right to go to a summer camp and to get his living, and perhaps pay, for taking charge of the athletics of that summer camp. What would be your natural answer? I think you would have to say that under this law he could not do it. They do it. A former captain of a Harvard football team had done that. I do not do this to expose him. In my opinion, that sort of thing ought to be allowed. Well, can a young man have a position in a school, a regular school, for the year, and have charge of the athletics there as a part of his duty, and still clear this law? I think you would say no. But in a famous case it was ruled that, although the man was a regular teacher in the school, and although a part of his duty, something that was expected of him, was to look after the athletics, he did not come under this rule. Apparently there had been some special understanding by which he was not to be expressly paid for the athletics. Per-

haps he could say that it was expressly understood that he was not to be paid for the athletics; but you know how such things go. You know that, if a principal is looking for a teacher, one of the first questions he asks frequently is: "Can that man be of use in connection with athletics?" and the man who can be of use in connection with athletics gets more money, gets the place sooner, than another man. And yet in this case I say it was ruled, it was ruled by an athletic committee, that such participation in athletics did not make the man a professional. The man played in an intercollegiate contest. After the game it was discovered that this same man had on a certain occasion taught some boys boxing, and the accusers were able to produce a receipt for the money. Then the man was declared a professional. Do you see any reasonable line of division between the one case and the other?

It was for many years the practice—I don't know whether it is the practice now, but I think it is—for students to go in great numbers to Philadelphia for a certain athletic contest along in the latter part of the winter or in spring. At that contest gold watches were offered for prizes. So far as I know, the athletic committees never meddled with that contest. If there is a violation of this rule anywhere, it seems to me that it is in that Philadelphia contest as it existed some years ago; and yet, so far as I know today, no athletic committee ever declared that to be a forbidden contest.

The action of the rule, then, is capricious. No man can tell in advance what act under this rule will be declared an amateur act and what will not; that is, he cannot say with any confidence where the dividing line will be. If you were to publish that rule in a proper commentary, it would be this. You would have to print across the face of that rule: "This rule is not to be taken literally. The dividing line between infractions which count and infractions which do not count is to be determined, without appeal, after the act by some athletic committee not yet known, if the matter happens to be called to their attention." That, I say, would show the uncertainty of the action of that rule.

That is not all. It is not merely in the uncertainty of its action that the rule is objectionable, but the rule puts into the list of capital offenses, from the standpoint of the athlete, acts which are not in themselves wrong or necessarily objectionable. "Take part in any contest for a money prize." Does that seem to you in itself wrong? Somewhat more than fifty years ago Mr. Charles W. Eliot, a Harvard undergraduate, was a member of a boat crew which rowed for a money prize. They won the prize. Mr. Eliot took his part of the prize. He has made public declara-

tion of it, and, so far as I know, he has never offered to make restitution. Now, are we not in an abnormal condition when we look upon the mere participation in an athletic contest for a prize as a base thing? Such a rule, which gets us into the habit of looking upon an act innocent in itself as something wrong, is a demoralizing rule. The fact is that we do not now fix our attention on this, that what is wrong in these cases is the lying about it and not the doing the thing. We have got very much in the way of thinking that the doing the thing is necessarily base. You cannot go on calling an innocent thing wrong without presently having us call wrong right. You will have a moral confusion inevitably. If you take an act which the moral sense does not condemn, and put that in the category of crimes, you will inevitably have crimes committed in defense of the innocent act.

How did the rule come into effect for colleges? I cannot undertake to give an accurate history of the matter; I have not looked the matter up from the historian's standpoint; but my recollection of it is about like this: that perhaps fifteen or twenty years ago, when the athletic temperature in all of our institutions began to rise, men began to come in for a few months of participation, just for the sake of the athletics. Special students who never passed an admission examination, and who could not pass any admission examination, would come in to take part in football for a few months, and then disappear when the football season was over. Of course, that was objectionable. It was to rule out such practices as that that a rule like this was adopted; at least, it was in part for that.

The rule was taken over, at least in spirit, if not in its exact lettering, from the attempts made by associations outside college for the regulation of amateur sports. We know now, better than people knew fifteen or twenty years ago, how well that rule works outside college. You know how easy it is to enforce outside college. You remember the case of a young man who was sent to England from a Massachusetts city to take part in the Henley regatta. He was to go as an amateur. Some of his townsmen wanted to send him; at least, they wished him to go. Did they give money to the boy? No, of course not. This rule forbade. What did they do? They paid the boy's father, a professional oarsman, \$2,000 (?) to train him for the event. So easy it is to get around the letter of this law. Here is a slip which I cut from one of the Boston papers last night:

The Amateur Athletic Union, especially its New York division, is passing through a season of revolution and cleansing, having unearthed a hotbed of professionalism and masquerading.

I will ask all those who watch the history of the thing whether that is not the chronic condition of amateur athletic associations—constant exposures of hotbeds of masquerading and professionalism. That is, the law does not succeed outside college.

People did not see, apparently, fifteen or twenty years ago, when they adopted that rule, for college use, that we have in college means which the so-called amateur associations outside college do not have for fixing a standard. We have rules of academic standing, academic residence, some of which we have begun to put in practice; or at least we have possibilities of such rules, and some such rules have already been framed. One of them, perhaps the most important, is this: that no special student shall take part in intercollegiate contests in the first year of his residence. That strikes out at once one of the greatest abuses which existed fifteen or twenty years ago. The special student must stay a whole year before he can go into an intercollegiate contest. Next, a rule that a student coming from one institution to another, a migrant student, must spend a year in the new institution before he takes part in athletic contests, if he has any athletic record before. That is an exceedingly valuable rule. Another, a rule that a student shall not continue for more than four years to take part in athletic contests. Another, that a student who is on probation, or has been dropped for poor scholarship, cannot take part in intercollegiate contests.

Now, all these are admirable rules. First, they are perfectly definite. When you say that a special student shall not take part in an athletic contest until he has been one year in the institution, you know perfectly well what is meant. All of these rules are perfectly definite. There cannot be much or any long-continued discussion as to what they mean. Second, every one of these rules depends for its operation on matters of record, of public record. How long has the student been in the institution? How long has it been since he entered? For how many years has he played this game or that? What is his state as to probation, or college standing generally? Perfectly ascertained matters. Moreover, they all deal with the right kind of qualifications; they are all tests of the right sort.

What do we want our young men to be who take part in athletic contests? We want them to be good representatives of college life, good representatives of the mental college life as well as of the physical. A man who enters college as a special student has given no proof of his mental capacity. If he has stayed a year, he has done something toward such proof. We do not want men whose main object in going to college is to take part in athletics, and so we have that rule to prevent a man from

going from one college to another simply for the sake of athletics. We put a year of discouragement in his way.

And then the four-year rule. We do not want a man to continue indefinitely taking part in intercollegiate contests, for various reasons. One is that as he grows older he gets a disproportionate weight and strength for a contest with very young men; and more than that, he becomes, if not in the pecuniary sense, in a still more objectionable sense, a professional, if he continues indefinitely to take part in these matters which should be the business of boys.

The probation and dropping—those rules commend themselves. If a student cannot, while taking part in athletics, maintain also a decent standing in his studies, he is not the fit representative of the college.

Why should not we extend these rules? Here are some of the extensions which I should propose:

First, I would have one year of probation for all students. In the Middle West they have six months of probation for a freshman. They have a year of probation for a special student, as we have. But they say that the special student and the freshman shall have passed in all of their work in order to be qualified to participate in intercollegiate contests. That is distinctly an improvement, in advance of our rule. It will not do, out there, for a man to scrape through simply, with conditions; he must have passed in all his work; and even a freshman must have had six months of probation. I would have a year of probation for everyone.

Second, I would have no special student whatever take part in any intercollegiate contest.

Third, I would have no holder of a bachelor's degree take part in intercollegiate contests. It should be the business of boys, not of grown men, who ought to be out of college and doing something else. This rule I would have to cut off the students who, after a prominent athletic career in some of the smaller colleges, come to some university, enter one of the professional schools, perhaps mainly with the object of taking part in the intercollegiate contests. I think, if you will look over the matter, you will find that a very considerable number of cases which have caused a good deal of discussion and scandal are those of men who have graduated at one college and have entered some institution connected with another one—men who are holders of bachelor's degrees.

Fourth, I would have no man more than twenty-four years of age take part in intercollegiate play, for reasons which I have already indicated. Such a man is, by his weight and strength, likely to be an unfit contestant. Moreover, a man of twenty-four or twenty-five years old—and we have

had some this last year in the field who were about thirty, some prominent athletes—a man much beyond the common age, is likely to be a dull man, and therefore not a fit representative of the college even for athletic sport; or he is likely to be an impecunious man, and so peculiarly subject to the temptation to make money out of his athletic relations.

Further, I would have no team play more than one public game a week in a season. Now we have a game, we will say, on Wednesday, and a game on Saturday—not only the team, but the whole college, excited by the contest more or less. It is more the spirit of this rule than the exact terms of it that I have in mind. Whether one contest a week is the best number I don't know; perhaps the number could be less than that; but a rule of that sort, I believe, would be valuable. And although I have spoken particularly with regard to the college, naturally, as the college condition is much more before me than the school condition, it seems to me that a rule restricting the number of games in the school would be very desirable.

I had a curious experience last year, which brought out something of the evils of the excessive attention to athletics in school. I prepared a circular which I proposed to issue to teachers of physics. I thought that teachers of physics were suffering from a lack of manual assistance in their duties about the laboratory. I wished to start a public agitation in favor of getting an appropriation in each school for paying somebody to do the drudgery of the lecture table. But when I met a number of the teachers of physics about here, I found that some of them said: "If you will relieve us from the duty of going around with athletic teams to see that they behave themselves in contests between schools, we will get along with the other difficulty." It seems that this duty bears particularly hard upon the teachers of science, because the teachers of science are usually men.

If we should make these extensions to our rules—and I believe them all perfectly practicable—and perhaps some other extensions, I don't know whether it would make very much difference whether we abolished the money rule altogether or not. The money rule which I read has been modified at Harvard. I could not get the modification in print; but it has already been modified by something like a statute of limitations for the boy before he comes to college. I hope that we are on the way to such a condition of things as will enable us to try the experiment of abolishing the money rule altogether.

What would be the evils to be expected from the abolition of that rule, even with the other safeguards which I have here proposed? Well, increase of summer baseball, increase of the practice of paying men in college. That is what people would say.

Now, as to the summer baseball, I am not very familiar with it. I happened to watch a game, which was a very likely one, this last summer. The ground was not an inclosed ground, but a money contribution was taken up from the spectators. The game apparently was participated in by some college men; at least, one man wore the name "Bowdoin" on his breast and another wore the name "Yale." Now, how bad was that act, if these men did divide among them the money taken up in that way, provided they did no lying about it? I can't find it very bad. I think it is perhaps a rather undignified way for a man to earn his living in the summer; but most of the ways which are open to young men of casual employment in the summer are rather undignified. I had very much rather have a boy take part in such a contest as that, take the money for it, support himself in that way during the summer, than be a waiter at a table and look for fees from the guests. It is more honest, it is more honorable in every way.

Now as to the practice of paying men in college. Would that increase? I think possibly it would. I would have this restriction, a perfectly easy one to establish: not a dollar of the money handled by athletic associations, not one dollar of the money under control of the athletic committee, should be spent to assist a student in any way in which he is not now assisted. That is a rule easy to carry out. And there would be a great moral influence in that rule.

Should we go farther? Should we maintain the rule we have now, and absolutely forbid any contribution of money from a private source to an athlete in college? Is it practicable to enforce any such rule? Suppose I am interested in a young man who is a good athlete, and who is a good young man in other ways. Is there anything which prevents me from saying: "I will pay the expenses of this young man in college"? Can any athletic committee rule out that young man because of such assistance? I think not. There are many ways of evading the rule as it now stands. I need not particularize, for the public prints are full of such cases of evasion. We might, I say, have possibly more of the paying of money for the support of athletes in college, if we abolished the money rule; but I am very sure that we should have vastly less scandal, vastly less lying and deception of all sorts, than we have now. Remember, there is nothing wicked in giving money to a young man to help him through college partly because you are interested in him as an athlete. There is nothing base in his taking that money, if he can maintain his standing as a student and his position as an athlete at the same time. Do away with the state of mind which this rule has established for many years, and con-

sider whether there is anything base in that. I say that the practice of giving and receiving money might increase somewhat; but I am confident that the practice of lying and deceiving in all ways in regard to such giving would diminish very greatly, and I should be willing to see the amount of that act increased fourfold, if I could diminish to one-quarter the amount of lying about it, which is the main evil.

I think you will see that the rules which I propose—especially, perhaps, the rule of a year of probation—would be a great discouragement to the contribution of money to hire athletes to come to college. To pay a man, with the risk of his failing to yet through the studies of the freshman year, with the risk of his getting out of athletic condition, etc., would be rather a venturesome undertaking. Rather a risky investment, I think most people would consider it, to hire a man to come to college with the idea of what he might do a year or more from now in college, in case he maintained his standing through the freshman year. The rules generally which I have suggested, you will find, would tend to discourage the practice of giving money in two ways: partly in the way which I have just indicated, by making the returns for that money more remote, and therefore more doubtful, and, second, by the confining of athletic activity to a better-selected class of young men. There, after all, I believe is the best safeguard.

In England this question does not give so much difficulty. The English succeed in maintaining amateur contests, such as that of the Henley regatta, and they are fortunate in that. How do they do it? By confining the contests to the gentleman class, that is, to the well-to-do class, who are not subject to temptations in regard to money. A man cannot take part in the Henley regatta, as I understand, who is in trade, or who has ever worked for his living with his hands, who has been a manual laborer in the ordinary sense. We don't want any such restriction. It is impossible here. What is the best substitute for it? What is the class of young men which comes nearest to being a class of gentlemen, on the whole? I believe it is the class of young men who have shown themselves capable of passing entrance examinations to college and of keeping their standing in college as students.

If by such rules as I propose, and such rules as are now in force, we can confine our contestants to the list of genuine undergraduate students, maintaining a fair standard of mental activity as shown by their record in their classes, a good standard of moral behavior as shown by their standing at the dean's office. I believe that we can safely abolish the money restriction with which we have vainly attempted to hedge in amateurs.

After such rules as I have here proposed, and perhaps some others, are established, I should like to see every institution say to another: "We shall not look into the record of your athletes; we are willing to play any team by which you are willing to be represented." (Applause.)

DISCUSSION

THE PRESIDENT: The discussion of this subject will now be opened by Mr. Arthur W. Roberts, of the Brookline High School.

MR. ARTHUR W. ROBERTS: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have learned the full depth of my presumption since I have been sitting here. To attempt to present in writing a reply to a discussion one has not heard in advance is presumptuous in anyone; most certainly it is so in my case.

As I have listened to Professor Hall's remarks, I have been surprised at one or two things. First, I find I am taking part in a debate. I did not know that before. I am not assigned to either side; I don't know just where I stand. In the second place, there are one or two things which he has brought up which I cannot resist the temptation to speak of, in spite of this paper of mine, which I don't want to throw away. He does not know, to bring up a concrete instance, how far-reaching his athletic committee work was a few years ago.

A little incident, trifling in itself, may bear on his individuals who race about the college yard for ten-cent prizes. The other day I read in one of the Boston daily papers that a certain young man had just been taken to the Harvard 'varsity training table, and I rejoiced in the incident for this reason: Some four or five years ago the headmaster of the school with which I am connected was approached to find some young man who would be a companion to a little boy of nine. A lady in the town desired to have her little son get out of doors more. She wanted a companion of an athletic sort, who would go bicycle-riding with him, play tennis with him occasionally, and perhaps go away in the summer with him. This young man, when offered the position, much to our amusement, said: "I don't know. I should like to do that very much, but the fact is, I don't know whether I'll ever get there; but I want to go to Harvard College some time, and play on the athletic teams. I am afraid I might not be allowed to play if I took that place." So I was rejoiced last week to find that this young man had been taken to the Harvard 'varsity training table. He has his reward.

Now, another point: I don't want to read my paper for another reason. Within twenty-four hours I have had a text suggested to me which it seems

as if anyone who knew how to preach, as I do not, might use successfully here today. It was not written by a member of any athletic committee of a college or school, not by any schoolmaster, but it gives us a line upon something we are all interested in here today. Let me quote just a few lines. I suppose, as few of us have read what we ought to since we read the prescribed English for Harvard College, most of you have not seen this:

University faculties, athletic chairmen, alumni committees sound the cymbals loudly and unite in a grand Salvation Army walk-around for undefiled sport; but let the test come and watch them scatter to cover. They say they want reform. They lie. If they really wanted it, they would have it.

"Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as others see us!"

Now my paper.

A year ago, at the meeting of this Association held at Wellesley College, you will remember that President Eliot gave us in retrospect an account of the work of the Association since its organization. After that meeting I chanced to fall in with Professor Hall, who remarked to me, in passing, that the reason for existence of this Association would seem to have disappeared. With the practical settlement of the question of the requisites for admission to colleges, there seemed to remain no topic of common interest alike to school-men and college representatives, which might occupy the attention and energies of both in an organization like this.

Much to my surprise, then, I received an invitation from the secretary a few days ago to take part at this meeting in the discussion of a topic—for brevity's sake let me call it "Athletics"—which, by the irony of fate, Professor Hall was to present before this body—a topic which even he must admit, and does admit by the very wording of the proposition which he has defended, is a matter of common interest to all its membership. It struck me, too, that if the committee in charge had been casting about for a topic which, from the view-point of Professor Hall a year ago, would establish the Association on a permanent basis, they had been eminently successful in finding one; in fact, the prospect of immediate settlement was so slight that we were likely to hand the topic on to our successors, and they in turn to theirs.

It would please me far more if the topic for today's discussion were "Athletics," as I lazily termed it a minute ago, and not the plague spot upon the surface of athletics which has threatened in the past to corrupt them utterly, and will always remain a meance to the good which they can and do accomplish.

I take it as generally admitted that a professional—i. e., one who receives or has received money in return for his prowess as an athlete—should not be a member of any team which may fairly claim to represent the athletic ability of the students of a school or college.

If we go a step farther and assert that it is wholly immaterial whether the services of an athlete are secured for a direct remuneration in money, or they are given for "value received," but in such a way that we cannot hear the rattle of the coin, then it is that the very difficulties of the situation cause some to hesitate, and the statement is not so readily admitted to be true. Members of committees or individuals who try to ferret out misdemaneors of this kind become hopeless of discovering all who are deserving of reprobation, and, aware that the strict application of the professional test must work hardship occasionally to deserving students, they begin to feel that the evil must be reached in some other way, and that the status of the individual athlete must be left within the discretionary judgment of each institution. Professor Hall suggests in his essay that we change our definition of professionalism. This is certainly radical enough, and, were it adopted, would be a boon to many a college athletic committee. It would certainly lessen their troubles greatly. Moreover, I most heartily indorse his proposal that an age limit be established, wherever one does not already exist, beyond which an athlete may not compete as a member of a school or college team. I see no good and sufficient reason why a person should be found representing a school in athletic competitions after he has reached the age of twenty, or a college after he is twenty-four. It is, of course, far from a disgrace, and often very much to a man's credit, that he is found in school or college when he has reached or passed these age limits; but it can hardly be claimed for him that he is a fair representative of the age which, under normal conditions, is found in the one or the other. If reports are to be trusted, some of our schools have placed their athletic teams well-nigh on a par with the college representatives partly, at least, by playing men who, were such a rule limiting the age of participants operative, could hardly be allowed to play upon the college teams they face. There would not be much difficulty about applying this age test, and it alone would often, no doubt, make it unnecessary to investigate the records of doubtful candidates along other lines. It is, in fact, among the ranks of these aged athletes that professionalism gets its most evident grip. Would that the problem admitted of a solution so easily applied as that.

In the last twenty years there has grown up, out of the games which most of us enjoyed so much as boys, a huge athletic system, which includes in its grasp everything which can be called a college or school, and a great

many so-called colleges and schools which are certainly not justified in bearing the names. Players have been developed possessing a degree of skill far surpassing anything we reached in our time, chiefly, perhaps, because paid coaches have been employed, and the course of training to which the athletes have been subjected has been made most strenuous. The idea has grown up everywhere that play is something which is to be taken seriously; that, if you are to play at all, you ought to play well—an idea which has resulted in most of our aforesaid play being metamorphosed into work of the toughest sort. It is now nearly twenty years since I heard the headmaster of a large school for boys tell his patrons, at the graduating exercises of the class of the year, that “they had been sending their sons to him to be taught to work, but they would send them in the not very distant future to be taught to play.” I remember the skepticism I felt while listening to this peculiar statement. Yet he proved to be a true prophet, and a pioneer himself, he has many imitators. Skilful paid instructors are needed and obtained to teach this “play,” most of them college graduates, who endeavor to bring the young men and boys under their charge up to the standard of college proficiency; and oftentimes they attain this in individual cases, owing to the presence of men of college age in the preparatory schools, or to unusually early physical development in some of the players. Toward these players the athletic element in the colleges looks with longing—and by athletic element I mean not only the players there, but the followers and hangers-on, who not infrequently have a financial interest in the success of their team when matches are played—desiring to secure these players to strengthen their teams, and fearing that their rivals may be more successful in attracting them. Then follows a struggle to influence these boys or men, and the worst feature of up-to-date athletics is before us, utterly demoralizing in its influence. While an age limit would remove many who under present conditions are fit subjects for this “influence,” it could not do away with the practice altogether, which would simply be applied to others not so disqualified by age. By this practice a course at one college becomes not only possible, but often luxurious to the skilful athlete, by the virtual sale of his athletic abilities, though it may well be that some other college was the natural selection for him if “uninfluenced.”

It is, of course, perfectly obvious that the responsibility for this state of things rests with the colleges, but an instance which has come to my notice recently will show that the schools are occasionally guilty of something very similar. The instance will also serve to show, if any explanation is necessary, how a young man of demonstrated athletic ability may find

himself in school or college with his tuition and living provided for, and yet be ready to sign a college affidavit that he is not a professional. A young man who had left school without completing his preparation for college is supporting himself in a clerk's position. Meanwhile he keeps up his athletics through membership in amateur organizations other than school teams, and makes an exceptionally good showing. Believing that he can turn this to good account, he consults with a reporter upon the staff of a daily newspaper and asks him, as he is a friend, "to give him a puff" in his paper. After some demurring, his friend agrees to print the picture of the young athlete together with a full account of his athletic triumphs, a list of his records, his weight, height, and sundry other bits of information about him, which might be interesting to some manager looking about for material for athletic teams in school or college. But all this was to be done for a specified sum of money, well and truly paid to the friendly reporter without the knowledge of the paper which employed him, and the matter printed as news and not as an advertisement. The young man's judgment was not at fault, for the investment brought him the return he looked for, and the manager of a school team found the man *he* was looking for. How was it done? Why, a scholarship, a certain amount of work for a specific sum, and plenty of presents to take care of such necessary items as room rent, board, tuition, etc. I am not giving you a hypothetical case, and I do not care to press the question of this young man's professionalism at present. But I ask you to consider whether he would be likely to entertain many scruples, were he approached a year or two later by emissaries of different colleges seeking to land him in their own bailiwicks, and not overparticular as to how they did it.

Doubtless some will argue, citing this case as an example, that it is better to have no rules at all, since they seem so ineffective, and to decide upon the membership of athletic teams by other methods, such as Professor Hall has suggested. I cannot think it wise to throw away the result of years of experience formulated in these rules, even though these may be imperfect in some ways. No one, I think, will claim that things are as bad today as they were a few years ago; for it has become increasingly difficult for a professional to be played upon any college team. May we not hope, by removing the defects of former legislation, to place athletics on the plane they should always have occupied, rather than by dropping rules which have served to make the situation better than it was? Professor Hall's suggestion of an age limit for the participants in college games is an excellent one, and though by itself, I think, insufficient to do away with the evil of professionalism, or even with the support of his other pro-

posed rules, it will be a valuable help in supplementing rules already framed. While it is generally true that the college teams are formed without reference to the age of the members, it is also true that in many school leagues there already is a limit fixed. This should be so in all schools and colleges, and made lower than it now is.

Professor Hall's argument in favor of limiting the number of games between institutions is certainly sound, and will meet with everyone's approval. Here more than anywhere appears the faulty judgment of the youthful managers of school and college teams. But surely I am not wrong in saying that the athletic committees in colleges and the headmasters of schools already possess or exercise the right of veto in the matter of schedules of games, without considering the question of professionalism at all. The interruption of a student's work, especially if games are played at a considerable distance from home, would seem to be a sufficient reason for restricting the number of games played. More than that, the exaggerated notion of their own importance to the institution with which they are connected (which the student players are apt to get) as well as the perverted idea the school or college public receives of the proper place of athletics in an educational system, because of the ease with which school and college duties of another sort may be set aside, afford additional reasons, if any were needed, why intercollegiate and interscholastic games should be few. I need not add that the atmosphere of work very largely disappears from the classroom on days of important interschool contests. We are fortunate if the influence does not extend over the days immediately preceding and following. In this regard a defeat is sometimes to be preferred to a victory, at least so far as applies to after-effects. To my mind, however, this restriction of the schedules of games does not affect the general question of professionalism at all. Granted that a game assumes so much importance in the eyes of a college community as does the single annual contest in football between Harvard and Yale, for instance, and the desire to secure the services of the best athletes for this particular contest would be quite as great as it would be if other contests were to follow.

Professor Hall's other proposition, which aims at raising the standard of academic standing required of all participants in school or college representative games, does not appeal to me so strongly. It is, of course, very true that the minimum demanded in some institutions is very low. That is a matter which I would leave with the conscience of the school or collegiate authority; for there is where it must be left anyhow. School or college standing is much like the ancient oracle—it needs interpretation. Anyone whose conscience does not trouble him now about his doubtful

athletes would probably find means of reinstating them upon the playing list just before important games, even if present standards were raised. In fact, I must confess to a certain degree of impatience when I read, as I often have, of the high standing in school or college of individual athletes or whole teams of athletes. The "sound mind in a sound body" argument has been carried very far; the tremendous results said to be possible for an athlete, by reason of his healthy body, when he applies his biceps and triceps to the solution of mental problems, are not so obvious to me as they should be. While there are exceptions within the experience of all of us, I think this can be taken as a fair statement: The average athlete, who lives up to the demands made upon him by the the training of the present day for intercollegiate or interscholastic contests, cannot hope to attain high rank as a scholar. During the strenuous season of football or baseball he is doing about all that can be asked of him, if he maintains a passable rank in his studies. I am quite ready to admit that this is not as it should be. Everywhere there is excess in the amount of time given to athletics, and perhaps the standard in preparatory schools has been set too high by the presence of eager trainers and coaches, who naturally endeavor to approximate as nearly as they can to the standard to which they have become accustomed in college play. These men, when employed by the boys themselves, are often an undesirable influence, possessing an irresponsible power, which they sometimes use in defiance of constituted authority. It is a decided move for the better when, as is true with some of our schools, the physical director employed by the school board is also a man capable of directing and controlling the boys in their sports, and serves as coach for the various teams. His tenure of office is not dependent upon his teams' success upon the field, if he prove himself a fitting physical director otherwise, and his membership upon the school staff brings him in touch with other members, and enables him to realize more fully a boy's total relation to his school life, and not his relation to athletics alone.

I believe, then, that the present standard of scholarship for athletes (in most schools) is as high as it should be, if honestly lived up to. The whole matter seem to me to sift down to something like this: Athletics are here to stay, and are therefore of vital importance in every school or college. Their administration presents great difficulties, but these must be met, and the whole matter not regarded as a temporary fad which will shortly pass, and so may be left to die a natural death. Their administration, too, must not be left in the hands of schoolboys nor, it would seem, of college students. If they are, their influence will be wholly bad. Hence there must be representatives of the school staff or college faculty upon all athletic gov-

erning boards, that the maturer judgment and less passionate partisanship of these older men may have a restraining influence upon the younger men and boys. So far as possible, general rules should be adopted by all associations, and, thanks to the activity of some of our western brethren, excellent rules have been framed, and are being adopted, I understand, through much of the West. That most demoralizing influence of all, the recruiting carried on in preparatory schools and elsewhere by the emissaries of colleges, must be stamped out. No person who rests under the least suspicion of being assisted to remain in this or that college should be allowed to appear as its representative in athletics. To some of us the fact that "common report" may be accepted in place of proof of professionalism seems somewhat unjust. This is, I think, the fact in the Middle West. But surely the burden of proof of his eligibility may properly rest upon each athlete himself without injustice.

It has been said that there should be established in each association of schools or colleges a senate or sort of Hague congress, to which all matters of dispute should be referred, and its decision should be final. One argument for this is that such a board could far more easily secure evidence against an athlete than could the athletic authorities of his own school or college, just as your neighbors are said to know more of the wrongdoing of your son than you know yourself. Another reason advanced for the forming of such a board is that the athletic board of school or college is thereby spared the odium to which they would be exposed if they debarred a valuable athlete—something which an outside authority would not feel nor heed. There is probably something in the former argument, and I suspect that it is the difficulty they experience in obtaining evidence against athletes commonly reported to have broken the professional rule, which causes Professor Hall and others to argue that it is better to dispense with a rule which can be easily rendered inoperative by indirect methods, and to substitute therefore simpler demands which it is easily in our power to enforce.

I have been arguing in favor of the retention of rules, despite their imperfection. I do not believe that we can get along without them, and am quite sure that letting down the bars would result in our having a set of hirelings playing another set of hirelings. Julian Hawthorne, speaking of football, put it rather humorously the other day. "If the football rivalry becomes more keen, we shall behold the college faculties going around with the hat to collect contributions to enable them to offer the giants lump sums of cash to join this or that alma mater: \$500, \$1,000; and finally the game will be played by elephants." Professional baseball,

judged from the standpoint of technical playing, is fine. In it you find almost the perfection of skill in handling bat and ball. But when considered from the view-point of local enthusiasm or pride in the players, it seems little short of ridiculous. That is just what we may expect in college sports, unless professionalism is stamped out.

A friend of mine writing to me about this matter recently, said: "The present definition of professionalism is bad. Any other would be equally bad." And this from a headmaster who is a strong advocate of athletics. His view, and that of many others, seems to be that the sense of honor in athletics is quite as high as that shown by some of our prominent financiers in insurance matters, for example; that the moral sense of the nation is at fault; and that we are dealing with but a single manifestation of the general weakness. If this is so—and I am inclined to think that it has its influence—and we must wait for the trusts to be reformed before we can hope to do much with our young men and schoolboys, then, alas and alas! how far away that future looks when the professional or semi-professional in school or college sport will be no more. Surely we must hurry President Roosevelt, or give him another term in spite of himself, that he may indirectly further the interests of pure sport.

But I wonder somewhat if we are not going about this reform in the wrong way in part. Might not the energy and time now given to securing our rights at the hands of our competitors be better employed in securing perfect freedom from culpability in our own schools? The mote in our brother's eye seems to be a full-sized beam from our view-point; while his vision in turn, despite the beam we can see there, is quite good enough to discern all our shortcomings. Much is said about the improving power of athletics upon a boy's moral make-up, when these are honestly conducted; and I fully believe this. But if sport is carried on in an atmosphere of suspicion toward one's fellows, this same sport will have an equally hurtful effect upon his moral standards for life. Someone has said that few men's actions, no matter what their principles may be, are higher in tone than those that are prevalent among their associates. A good deal of talk about "ringers," etc., is sometimes heard among schoolboys, particularly after the school team has suffered a defeat. Now, it seems to me probable that players who have discovered some unfair advantage taken by the members of a team which is a rival of their own, finding themselves unable to enforce their own standard upon their opponents, will drop to the plane of their rivals and defend themselves with the same old plea: "they all do it; we must do the same or be beaten." It seems to me that this must be discouraged by every means in our power. Foreign

missionary work is a good thing, no doubt. But in the work of purification of athletics our proper place for labor is chiefly in the home field. There is a feeling abroad among our young athletes that victory must be secured at any cost, and by any necessary means. It is our business to instill into our boys the feeling that they should love sport for sport's sake, be gentlemen, give their opponents no reason to suspect them, and respect their opponents. The only permanent settlement of these troubles will come when the school public has been brought to look upon these things as it should. The chief responsibility for effecting this lies with the schools naturally; but the colleges will not, in all probability, find this work so fully done that they can afford to neglect it. I am aware of the magnitude of the task proposed, but that is no excuse for not setting about it. It must of necessity take a long time for accomplishment; but meanwhile let us trust headmasters, and athletic committees, to eliminate such evils as can be reached with the help of our rules when enforced. There are scalawags among headmasters, we all know, and morally deaf people upon athletic committees; but, in general, they can be trusted to do the right thing; for no school or college can long find worthy competitors, if a policy of underhandedness or overreaching is persisted in.

THE PRESIDENT: The matter is now before the Association. We have a little over a half-hour for discussion.

PRESIDENT FLAVEL S. LUTHER, of Trinity College: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I do not know that I am quite qualified to speak on this subject, because I am in the class with the eminent gentlemen whose name has been mentioned here today; in that I am myself a professional, having contended for, and I am pleased to say won, a prize of, I think, fifty cents at the early age of thirteen in a foot-race for half a mile. The disqualification may have been outlawed, however.

I am bound to say that this suggestion of the degrading effect of taking money for exhibited excellence in athletics does not appeal to me. The last speaker, excellent as were his remarks, begged the whole question that is really before us when he said: "It will not be maintained by anyone that a person who has received money as a reward of athletic prowess should have any place on a college team." That is the very question which is at issue in a good many minds today, for the distinction between the amateur and the professional is, as was stated by Professor Hall, an importation in this country. The words have come from a place where they stand substantially for gentleman and workingman; and that sort of distinction is not one which is likely to be recognized by the American public at present.

To say that a young man, as soon as he plays ball well enough so that people will pay to see him do it, shall then be stopped from playing ball in the community to which he belongs, is, I say, to beg the whole question. I doubt whether that is always, and in all respects, and in all places, wise. For, mark you, that is a test which we do not apply to other things. When a man can do a thing well enough so that the world says that it has a money value, we do not stop his doing it; we encourage him to do it more. We shall insist that the man shall be honest and true, that he shall not lie; but the mere fact that he can do a thing better than somebody else—so much better, I repeat, that people are willing to pay to see it done—is not, and ought not to be, a disqualification, in the opinion of a great many people.

How is it in other things, in other college contests, for example? Take the case of the religious-minded young man, who officiates at some mission station and gets paid for it, and by making speeches there, which may or may not improve his congregation, at all events improves his power of verbal delivery, so that it makes him a more desirable member of the debating club. Should he be ordered off the stage when an intercollegiate debate takes place?

Take another case, ladies and gentlemen—a case that has occurred within my own experience within a few months. Trinity College chances to belong to a small association of colleges in which are offered certain intercollegiate prizes, among them one for excellence in certain specific work in the Latin language and literature. I am very glad to say that a pupil of my own won one of those prizes last year. He has been tutoring in Latin and Greek for two years at college, partly supporting himself thereby. He was a professional. I do not suppose that the idea occurred to him, or to any of his competitors, or to any of his classmates, and masters, and preceptors, and teachers, that he did anything wrong, or that the term “professional” could be applied to him as a synonym of obloquy. But he was a professional. He was exactly in the position of a man who plays on a college team after having played well enough somewhere else to be paid for it.

If men lie about what they have done, of course that is wrong; and there has been some of that, I suppose. I quite agree with the last speaker that it may be possible to enforce this rule, that a man who has received money as reward for doing athletic sports about the best they can be done shall be debarred from doing them any more as a college student. We can do that if we decide that it is wise, I think. I very much doubt whether it is wise, because when you get down to the root of the matter, ladies and

gentlemen, every college student and every schoolboy that takes part in athletics today in an inclosed ground, where there is gate money, is a professional. They are being paid to play, and the fact that the money does not go from the drawer in which it is kept at the gate directly into the pockets of the athlete does not change the thing one whit. They are playing so well that it has a money value. They are being paid for doing it. They get a personal benefit out of it. What becomes of these thousands, the \$50,000 and the \$75,000 income of some of the athletic associations of our larger universities? Why, the athletes themselves have board of a character and excellence which they could not possibly have in any other way and pay for it, and such as very few of us, I suppose, ever will enjoy. They have the service of personal body servants and valets. They travel with a luxury to which most of their instructors are strangers. They receive a large part of their apparel. They are paid in this way and in that way. A great many of their personal expenses during the season are defrayed from that gate money, which they earn by the might of their muscles. They are all of them professionals.

If some one tears down the board fence, takes away the gates, says, "Don't let us have our men playing ball and have somebody else pay for having them play;" and the expenses are divided up so that the money motive really disappears, I think we might then—we might then—fold our garments about us and look with horror upon the professional; but while we are all encouraging the money motive, while we are taking money at the gates of our college athletic fields and on our school playgrounds every chance we can get, and as much as we can get, for the building up of the athletics, for the helping and the protection, and a part of the maintenance, of the athletes, those athletes are, every one of them, professionals in the strongest sense in which that word can be used. I would go with anybody who says, "Down with the board fence." There was a time, and not so many thousands of years ago either—it was when I was in college myself—there was a time when I think that the college undergraduate felt it was distinctly *infra dig.* for him to play where gate money was charged. Why we should have felt that at the same time that we were glad to get money at the door of a theater where we were giving glee club concerts I cannot say, but that was the feeling. I think it is now *infra dig.* The reform in our athletics, ladies and gentlemen, the reform in our athletics, Mr. President, I firmly believe will come when that board fence comes down, when the gate money is no longer paid, when the athletes take care of themselves, own their uniforms, play their games like healthy, earnest-minded young men and boys, and cease to make a specu-

lation of it. The scandal of the whole thing is right at the gate, Take that down, and we shall need very much fewer rules. Meantime, I must say I rather agree with Professor Hall that it is better to exact severe standards of scholarship, and cease to inquire into the fact of whether a man has or has not played his game well enough so that somebody has been willing to give twenty-five cents to see him do it. (Applause.)

MR. HUBER GRAY BUEHLER, of the Hotchkiss School: I should much rather hear Mr. Stearns, of Andover, speak on this subject than speak on it myself, but I feel that it is my duty to express my substantial agreement with the thesis of Professor Hall. I do not feel ready to give an opinion on all the rules which he proposes, but it seems to me that his arraignment of the money test for professionalism amounts to a demonstration.

My intimate interest in this question dates from the appearance last spring of certain articles in one of our monthly magazines, which I read with close attention. They seemed to have been conscientiously prepared by a person who had taken a great deal of care to get at facts; but it so happened that I was in a position to know more intimately than he the character of one of the persons whom he arraigned. Reading those articles with sympathy and interest, I found it impossible to square the theory of professionalism, which in them was assumed to be right, with my knowledge of the character of one of the young men who, tried by that test, was held up before the country for reprobation.

Three young men, whom we will call A, B, and C, to their lasting credit worked their way through the Hotchkiss School by honorable service. They paid the school nothing in money, though they did render it a great return in their influence for good in character and in scholarship. Those three men were alike in these respects: They entered the Hotchkiss School for no other purpose than to get an education, so far as it could educate them. When they applied and were admitted, there was no thought at all of whether they were or were not good in athletics. They were graduated from the Hotchkiss School, and went to different institutions—one to Harvard, one to Yale College, one to the Sheffield Scientific School. Each man's choice of a college had been made before he entered the school, or soon after.

A became the president of his class at Harvard. He had no money except that which he earned. He paid his way handsomely through college by tutoring and rendering other honorable services; but, as Dr. Luther has suggested, that tutoring did not disqualify him for taking part in any intellectual contest for money or other prizes.

B entered the Sheffield Scientific School. He had a frail body. He could not excel in a single form of athletics. But he did have a clear head, and even before he entered our school he had helped to support himself by working on the night staff of a daily newspaper in his home in Pennsylvania. Nearly all the money he had earned before he came to school he had earned with his pen; and yet, when he entered the Hotchkiss School, we did not disqualify him from entering our oratorical contest, where he took the first prize of twenty-five dollars; and I imagine that his record will not disqualify him in the Sheffield Scientific School for any intellectual contest that he wishes to enter.

C, belonging to this same class in character, just as honest, just as honorable, just as sincere in his desire for an education, cannot excel with his pen, but he can excel in athletics. He entered Yale College in good faith, and from high motives. The athletic interests of Yale College have a right, a perfectly legitimate right, to what he can contribute to the athletic life of the college; and if he would not make that contribution, if he would not go out into the squad and take his part, he would be justly accused of disloyalty to the institution which he had entered. But he has no money, any more than the others; and if he goes on the football squad or the baseball squad, he will not have time for making money as a boy with a pen can do, or as the president of the senior class at Harvard did. If he receives any money assistance at all, however innocent in itself, from the athletic association or any other source in Yale College, he is instantly held up to the country as doing a base thing. Yet there is no boy who has gone out from the Hotchkiss School in the last few years of whom we are prouder for his character.

Therefore I say I cannot make this definition of professionalism which hinges on the money test, square with my knowledge of facts or my sense of true justice.

PRESIDENT GEORGE E. FELLOWS, of the University of Maine: Mr. President, I kept my seat because I did not know that I had anything new to offer on the subject. I do not think I have. This is a topic in which I am very deeply interested, and I was very much interested in the articles spoken of by the gentlemen on the other side of the room, which appeared in one of our magazines recently. I did not know the individuals there named; but it seems to me that if those statements were made upon facts, then there is something for us to do as associations of college and preparatory-school people. There is something for us to do between the college and the preparatory school. I have not had personal experience with efforts being made in preparatory schools to induce athletes to attend

college; I have no doubt, however, that such efforts have been made, as the facts were cited in those articles.

Now, I find myself in the peculiar position (I have no doubt that many others find themselves in the same situation) of seeing a great deal of truth on both sides of this question. I do feel that it is a very hard thing for a young man to be prevented from taking part in athletics because he has at some time, perhaps in the remote past, received money. I know of an individual who was at one time one of the stars on the University of Chicago football team, who played for three years on that team, and had no idea—I believe he was as honest in it as could be—that he was in any way wrong in playing. But the agent of another team that was in strong competition with the University of Chicago discovered that, when that young man was a second-year high-school boy in Omaha, a little town in Missouri, not very far away, that had never had a football team, wanted somebody to tell them how to play football. They did not even know the rules. They did not know anything about 'it, and there was nobody near by to tell them. A chance traveling-man said that he knew some boys in Omaha that played football in the high school, and he "guessed he could get one of them to come down and tell them how the game was played." And so this boy went down, at the age of about fourteen, and told them what he knew about football, and went back, and stayed two years more in the Omaha High School. In course of time he went to the University of Chicago and played football there; and this was discovered just before the most severe game in the last year that he was to be there. Of course he said, "If that is professionalism, I am a professional," and dropped out. I have forgotten whether Chicago lost that game or not, but it did seem peculiarly hard. And yet, on the other hand, there are these facts which go to show that men are trained for years beforehand to go to a particular college, if they can be bought. I confess that I am as much at sea as most of those who discuss the subject appear to be.

THE PRESIDENT: Principal Stearns, of Phillips Academy, Andover, is with us, and will tell us what he knows about this matter.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. STEARNS, of Phillips Academy, Andover: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Association: I was not intending to say anything on this subject this afternoon. Indeed, I am rather taken by surprise to be called on, not being a member of the Association, I believe; and then I feel, too, that the subject has been pretty thoroughly covered.

I was intensely interested in hearing what the first speaker had to say, because in almost every instance, except in the matter of age limit, his views were exactly in accord with those which I hold myself. In the

matter of the age limit, I think those connected with Andover, and Exeter, and Williston, and possibly one or two other schools which are, I believe, different in their make-up from the average preparatory school, are a little touchy. Some of the very best, the truest men we get, are men who are above the ages that you mention here as the proper limit, and I cannot see any fair reason why those men should be debarred, if they are qualified as students, if their athletic work is not interfering with their school work, and if their influence is right. However, that is a side issue just now.

The matter of professionalism, the requirements which go to make up a professional, if I may call them that, it seems to me call for a pretty vigorous overhauling. Two summers ago, at the meetings of the American Institute of Instruction at Bethlehem, I was asked to speak on the general topic of athletics. I had a case in mind at that time which had stirred my indignation pretty thoroughly, and I took occasion to say then that I thought this idea of holding summer baseball playing up to the public as one of the worst crimes of the century, and something which placed a stigma upon a boy for all the rest of his life, was absolutely wrong, and that I thought the trouble lay with the spirit of the thing; that, in fact, we were getting hysterical over some outward manifestations of an inward rottenness, and were lopping at the branches and leaving the roots to run riot in the wrong kind of soil. It seems to me that statement is perfectly true.

The case which I had in mind at that time was the case of a man who had been offered a position to take charge of a summer playground for the benefit of small boys from the city of Boston. The work which was to be assigned to him was the work of caring for those youngsters, being out with them in their sports, giving them good, healthful, and invigorating out-of-door life, and being a good, wholesome influence generally. That fellow came to me and asked my advice about it; and I said to him: "Well, it is a crying shame if you cannot do this, but you are going to college, and my advice is to appeal to the college authorities and make sure that it is right. There are so many technical things that have to be considered nowadays. I don't want you to get into trouble, and I don't want to urge you to do this unduly. Go to those authorities, and find out." The fellow was headed for Yale, and he wrote to Mr. Camp. Mr. Camp took the matter up with Mike Murphy, the famous trainer, and the result was that Mike Murphy made his only visit to Andover of which I have knowledge in the eight or nine years that I have been connected with the school, in spite of the rumors that he has been making annual visits there for questionable purposes. Murphy came up there at our request to talk

this situation over. He said to the boy in question: "It is too risky a proposition. You cannot afford to do it. You will surely be called professional if you do." The fellow felt pretty badly about it; and I felt so, too. I could not have picked out, if I had been given the opportunity, a chance for that fellow, knowing his make-up as I did, that would have been of more real, lasting value to him than that opportunity which was given him there. But he had to throw it over. And so, to live within the letter of the law and still do some work—for he had to work his way in part—he accepted a position in a summer hotel as a baggage porter. On the basis of the professional standards which prevail, that step was all right. There he was brought under the very worst influences that a boy of his years could encounter, knocking about a summer hotel, with a great deal of his time to himself, and in close contact with employees, a great many of whom, as we all know, are not of a very high class. But that was all right. He could pass as an amateur, and he could be clear of charges of professionalism. But to go out on the playground in an outside district of Boston, and take charge of twenty or twenty-five street urchins, and help them to better physical and moral life—that was bad, and he could not afford to run the risk.

I confess I have seen so many cases of that kind that I was indignant through and through at that time, and I made this statement on the strength of my feelings; and I have felt more and more confirmed in the position ever since. The trouble is, as I have said before, that we are hysterical over some outward manifestations of an inward evil, and in our efforts to cure the thing we are beating the air and trying to drive these superficial things out, and are letting the inward things take care of themselves. I do not see any reason why a man cannot honorably earn a penny or two, or a dollar or two, if necessary, playing summer ball, if he lets it be known. As has been said here and emphasized so splendidly, the main thing is honesty; and if we can teach our boys to be honest in their sports, honest right under our eyes, it seems to me we have got at the whole root of the matter. We cannot do it on this present basis, and no amount of rules will do it. The very fact that you multiply your rules leads boys to feel, and leads them to know, in some cases—take the case I have just mentioned, for example—that the rules in individual instances do work manifest unfairness; and then a boy begins to say, "Well, that is clearly unjust;" and it is a short step from that to sopping his conscience and going a little farther, until before long he places himself in a position where he is held up to blame, and perhaps justly so.

Personally, the more I think of this thing, the more I feel as though

we must come to the position—we ought to come to the position—where we can simply say to another institution, our rival: “We give you credit for being normal, civilized, moral, human beings, with some sense of right, and wrong, and justice, and honesty, even if you are our rivals; and you know, far better than we know, who is fit to play on your team. If this man is a *bona fide* student of your institution, is taking care of his scholarship, is taking care of his regular standing, is meeting all of your requirements, what if he has committed years ago some slight indiscretion—or call it indiscretion, it is hardly that—which technically places him under the ban?”

I have played summer ball, and I have enjoyed it, I have not played for money, but I have played with men who have taken money for it, and I suppose that I am a professional, bringing it down to the interpretation given here today. I dare say that I could rake up other cases that would prove me a professional. I have played where gate money was taken, and in that sense I certainly am, perhaps, too, in larger sense. But, at any rate, baseball playing, in my mind, is objectionable chiefly for the class of men with whom it brings you in contact, and the general influences to which it subjects a boy. It is not a good thing for a boy to knock around at a summer hotel, playing two or three games a week, and spending the rest of his time in the billiard-room or hanging about the hotel piazza, etc. He ought to have something better to do. Yet that may be better in some cases than what the average boy would otherwise do. But in my mind, as I have said, summer baseball has that as the most objectionable feature connected with it, provided any tendency to dishonesty is done away with, and we can simply have it known and published when and how and where, and what a man takes in remuneration for his services.

There is another point, however, which has been touched on, that is one of the meanest evils connected with this whole business. Two weeks ago a boy who was captain of our baseball team last year just failed to get into Princeton. He had another year of preparation by right; he really was not fitted to go. He was a fellow of only average standing, but fair standing, not a poor scholar, not a brilliant scholar. He tried by doing some summer work to get into Princeton in the fall, and he just barely failed. He came back to Andover and consulted with me as to what he had better do. It was not a question of his athletics or anything of the kind. It was so clear a case of a fellow needing another year that I told him it was the only thing to do. He said: “You don’t think I had better go to a smaller college?” I said: “By no means.” Before he had been in Andover three days he came to me and showed me letters,

which I read word for word, from managers and captains of college teams. I won't mention any names, but they are as respectable colleges as are supposed to exist in this good old New England. They were simply filled from page to page with the most extravagant offers of what they would do for him if he would come there, and holding out temptations to which any boy—he was only a boy, we have got to remember that—to which any boy, unless he was an unusual boy, would feel some inclination to yield. Though he might not yield, this is a kind of temptation to which no boy has any business to be exposed. One letter started out and said something like this—I can repeat it almost word for word. It called him by his name, because the writer had happened to come across him one summer in connection with his playing. It read about as follows:

DEAR CHARLIE:

I hear you have not passed at Princeton. I am so sorry But, on the other hand, I am glad for our sake, because I know you can be here. You don't know how crazy the college is for you. The college is simply wild. We will give you the greatest reception when you get here. You need not worry anything about the entrance requirements. That has all been arranged; there won't be any trouble whatever. I have arranged for you to room with so and so, so that your room won't cost you anything. In the matter of board, you have got a position waiting for you here at the hall, which won't require any great work on your part, and your board will be looked after. We have also engaged with Wright & Ditson's agent to have you take their agency here, and we are prepared to give you our written guarantee that during your four years' course the football, baseball, and track teams of this institution will purchase all their goods through you.

Several other offers of a similar nature were made, and then the author in a burst of enthusiasm wound up with this statement:

The fact is, Charlie, you will leave here with money in your pocket.

Now, that is not an exaggerated case, or, if it is an exaggerated case, there are many more like it. The large schools, like Andover and Exeter, where the boys are older from the very nature of things, are subjected to that sort of thing more, I suppose, than are any other schools in the country, until it has come to be a crying shame. I have seen more than one good boy ruined by constant pressure of that kind—pressure from managers and captains. Regular delegations will come and visit the town, stay in town for two or three days, make their presence known, communicate with prominent athletes, and begin that miserable campaign which is, if not checked, tending to undermine the ideals and the moral character of even fairly good boys, because it is only natural for us to expect that a boy who is subjected to that sort of an influence from college men will

feel that there must be something more in his athletic prowess than even he has dared to dream of before, and that, if it were not so, if this prowess did not mean a great asset for him, then the colleges themselves, which must know that this thing takes place to a certain extent, would take a hand and put a stop to it. I believe the time has come when it is the business of every man connected with a school or a college who finds an individual in that institution doing that sort of thing—for the individual could not do it unless supported by public sentiment—to show him the door of the institution and say: “You are no longer wanted here.” If you get to a point of that kind, I believe you can put a stop to this business; and if we sit idly by and simply let the matter go on, we shall keep on going from bad to worse.

Coming back for a minute, in closing, to what I just said in regard to honesty, the point that Professor Hall has emphasized so strongly and so well, it seems to me that there lies the root of the whole matter; and the conditions in our political and business life today, as they have recently been brought so strongly before us, only emphasize more and more the duty of the schoolmaster and the heads of institutions everywhere to insist, in dealing with their boys, upon the necessity that honesty, and only honesty, shall prevail in all of their contests. We send a boy out of school for dishonesty in the classroom. Judged by our present standards, it would seem, if we carried the thing to a logical conclusion, as if we did that because we were personally insulted that that boy should take advantage of us, not because it is a dishonest act; but because he deceived us, who were teachers, and who ought to be able to have prevented him from doing it. If that is not so, how is it that we can do that and then stand on the side lines of a football game, and over and over again see the coaches and players and others deliberately evading the rules, resorting to trickery and deceit in various ways which are known to every man who understands the game, and say nothing about it? It is just as truly dishonesty in one case as in the other. In fact, it seems to me that it is infinitely worse for a boy to deceive his mates than it is for him to deceive his teachers, if there is any propriety in allowing a degree of difference. But there is a tradition which some boys entertain in regard to the deception of their schoolmasters which perhaps does not always lead them to know where to draw the line. A boy naturally feels that he has got a certain right to get ahead of his teachers—perhaps he may not call it deceiving, dishonesty—but there is no fellow living who has got any “stuff” in him at all who believes that it is a right thing to deceive, deliberately, his mates. If you get right down and talk with him in quiet moments, when he has

cooled off, about it, there is not one, I believe, who will not admit this. And yet we allow it to go on, and in doing that we are starting those boys at just the most impressionable age in altogether wrong lines.

Now, in regard to the so-called amateur rules. There has been a great deal of talk about them. It seems to me that the rule we have got to come to, if we are ever going to accomplish anything, is a rule which shall speak absolutely and emphatically to any man who is caught deceiving, or in any way purposely evading the laws or the rules of the game. I think it is perfectly proper to make a distinction in the matter of breaking rules. A man in an impulsive moment may hit a man. That is an impulse. That does not indicate any viciousness on the part of the boy. But if he deliberately and in a studied way goes about evading a rule for the sake of getting a little farther ahead, that is a totally different matter. I hope the time will come when a rule will be brought up and put in force, saying that a boy who does that sort of thing shall leave the field, and that *nobody shall take his place*. I do not believe we shall ever come to the right situation until we take such rigid and stringent measures as that; and when once we have done that, it won't take a boy very long, in my judgment, to find out that the school and school authorities and school traditions stand for honesty, and that, unless honesty is insisted upon and practiced, their games are worse than nothing. One or two examples of that kind will be all that is necessary. If a team does lose because a man goes off under such circumstances, so much the better, if we accomplish the end we are after.

I do not believe that we know, or begin to appreciate, all of us, just how bad some of these things are; and yet I personally feel that we should be in a distinctly worse condition if athletics were given up. Athletics are capable of tremendous influence for good in schools, and in the main they accomplish good; but these particular evils it is our duty to look into more carefully, and to eradicate along some such lines as have been suggested today. (Applause.)

PROFESSOR HALL: Mr. President, I want to urge that we should not in our indignation against dishonesty and deceit, as Mr. Stearns has emphasized, forget our duty to remove stumbling-blocks and temptations from the way of young men; and I believe this rule is a great stumbling-block, that it leads straight to lying.